

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an *Official Action* that issued in this case on April 15, 2008. In that *Action*, the Examiner:

- Allowed claims 39-41 and 47-51;
- Rejected claims 42-46, 52-57, 59-61, and 63-70; and
- Objected to claims 58 and 62.

Responsive to the Action, claims 42-46, 52-56, 63-64, and 70 are canceled, claims 57-58, 60-62, 65, and 67 are amended, and claims 71-72 have been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Claims 57-60

The Examiner indicated that claim 58 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims.

Old claim 58 included the limitation "when the user applies a sufficient amount of force to the pseudo vein, the pseudo vein cannot be felt." The Examiner found that the prior art does not teach or suggest this feature. This limitation has been added to claim 57, which, based on the Examiner's comments, ought to place it in condition for allowance.

It must be noted that limitation (c) of claim 57, which recited that the palpation module "is operable to vary a simulated stiffness of the rigid pseudo vein" has been deleted. This limitation has been deleted because it does not appear to be required, based on the Examiner's comments, to support the patentability of amended claim 57.

The limitation deleted from claim 57 now appears in amended claim 58. A limitation has been deleted from claim 60. It is believed that claims 57-60 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 61-70

The Examiner indicated that claim 62 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims.

Like old claim 58, old claim 62 included the limitation "when the user applies a sufficient amount of force to the pseudo vein, the pseudo vein cannot be felt." This limitation has

been added to claim 61, which, based on the Examiner's comments, ought to place it in condition for allowance.

Limitations (c) and (d) of claim 61 have now been deleted. Limitation (c) recites that the palpation module "generates a force that opposes downward motion of the pseudo vein" and limitation (d) recites that "the palpation module controllably obscures the pseudo vein under the pseudo skin such that the pseudo vein can be felt, or not felt, as desired." Once again, these limitations have been deleted because they do not appear to be required, based on the Examiner's comments, to support the patentability of amended claim 61.

Limitation (d) from claim 61 now appears in claim 62. Limitation (c) from claim 61 now appears in claim 65. Claims 66 and 67 have been amended to depend on claim 65. Claims 63, 64, and 70 have been canceled.

It is believed that claims 61-62 and 65-69 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 71-72

New claims 71 and 72 are ultimately dependent upon claim 57. They include limitations that appear in other claims sets (see, e.g., claims 65 and 66). It is believed that claims 71 and 72 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 39-41, 47-51, 57-62, 65-69, and 71-72 now presented for examination are allowable over the art of record. A notice to that effect is therefore requested.

Respectfully,
David Feygin et al.

By **/Wayne S. Breyer/**
Wayne S. Breyer
Reg. No. 38,089
Attorney for Applicants
732-578-0103 x212

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America